

# ON THE *UTTARA-KĀṆḌA* OF THE *RĀMĀYAṆA*

BY

J. VEKERDI

1. The additional character of the first and last books of the *Rāmāyaṇa* was recognised long ago by European scholars.<sup>1</sup> The main arguments compelling us to consider these books as apocryphal parts of the epic can be divided into three groups: *a*) Mythologically, Rāma appears there as embodiment of god Vishnu while in books II—VI he is a mortal hero. *b*) Compositionally, the plot of the story comes to a close with the regaining of Sītā and of the kingdom in book VI; the second repudiation of queen Sītā in VII, 45 is an awkward repetition of VI, 115 sqq. *c*) Stylistically, I and VII are conglomerates of episodes having nothing to do with the Rāma-story; and even those of them that are connected with the heroes of the poem are not considered in the authentic parts.<sup>2</sup> These statements of the European philology have in recent times been acknowledged by Indian scholars, too.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. Holtzmann was the first to demonstrate (*Über den griechischen Ursprung des indischen Thierkreises* [1841], pp. 36 sqq.) that book I (*Bāla-kāṇḍa*) shows some contradictions to the other parts of the R.; furthermore, from inner contradictions in book I it is clear that it is the work of different authors. A detailed analysis of the question is to be found in A. Weber, *Über das Rāmāyaṇa* (1870) and in H. Jacobi's excellent monograph, *Das Rāmāyaṇa* (1893). Cf. also Winternitz, *Geschichte der indischen Literatur*, I (1909), pp. 420 sq., 423.

<sup>2</sup> The first testimony in Sanskrit literature for regarding the *Bāla-kāṇḍa* and *Uttara-kāṇḍa* as organic parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is the *Raghuvamśa* of Kālidāsa (IV<sup>th</sup> century?), cf. canto XIV—XV. with a detailed narration of the Uttara. It must be pointed out, however, that the later sources, up to the Hindi poet Tulsī Dās (XVI. century), follow the text only of books I—VI, while concerning the Uttara they are eclectic, e.g. the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* repeats the Lavaṇa-story but omits the repudiation of Sītā. Similarly, the only source earlier than Kālidāsa, viz. the *Rāmōpākhyāna* in Mbh. III, 273—290, repeats the Rāvaṇa-story but omits both the Lavaṇa and the Sītā-story. In view of the identical eclecticism in the earlier and later sources we can make no use of the *argumentum ex silentio* in the Mbh.: it is possible that the whole R. (with the Uttara!) existed before the *Rāmōpākhyāna*. A detailed analysis of the question see in Śluszkiewicz, *Przyczynki do badań nad dziejami redakcyj Rāmāyaṇy* (*Contributions à l'histoire des recensions du Rāmāyaṇa*), Kraków 1938, pp. 1—38 and 266—268.

<sup>3</sup> Cf., e.g., Hridaynārāyan Singh in *Nā. Pra. Pa. Saṃv.* (1933) XVII, p. 259—289, cited by Barannikov, *Indijskaja filologija*, Moskva 1959, p. 221.

Without refuting the principal points of this theory, in the twenties of this century some Indian and European scholars took up a diametrically opposite position. D. C. Sen<sup>4</sup> examined a great number of Bengālī folk tales and popular legends in which the events are quite different from those in the narrative of the original *Rāmāyaṇa*. A similar problem was encountered by W. Stutterheim. When he sought to explain the Rāma reliefs in Indonesian temples he had to search for other sources than those in Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*, and he found them in folklore legends wide-spread from Pañjāb to Java with comparatively great similarity.<sup>5</sup> Fundamental differences are, among others, in the genealogy of the heroes. Here the king of the rākṣasas, Rāvaṇa, is the father of Sītā and wants to marry his own daughter (!), or she is sister and wife (!) of Rāma, etc.<sup>6</sup> A common feature in all these primitive, rude and confused stories with the *Uttara-kāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is that the motives of demonology and ape-worship play a striking part in them, in contrast to the deeply human character of Vālmīki's *Rāmāyaṇa*. The above-mentioned scholars came to the conclusion that these popular legends preserved a more ancient (even because more primitive) tradition than the work of Vālmīki (*i.e.* R. II–VI).<sup>7</sup> If this is true, then we are entitled to regard also the apocryphal parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa* as preserving some more ancient traditions. A deeper analysis into the apocryphal books of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, however, does not seem to bear out this assumption.

2. The most of the stories in the *Bāla-* and *Uttara-kāṇḍa* deals with the heroes of books II–VI. Usually, these stories are built up on some short

<sup>4</sup> *The Bengālī Rāmāyaṇas*, Calcutta 1920.

<sup>5</sup> *Rāma-Legenden und Rāma-Reliefs in Indonesien*, München 1925. Cf. also A. Zieseniss, *Die Rāma-Sage bei den Malaien*, Hamburg 1928. Devendra Satyarthi, *Uriyā grām-sāhitya meṇ Rām-carit*; *Nā. Pra. Pa. Saṃv.* (1891) XV, pp. 313–330, cited by Barannikov, *op. cit.*, pp. 55 and 223.

<sup>6</sup> Following the opinion of D. C. Sen, J. Kats (*The Rāmāyaṇa in Indonesia: BSOS IV* [1927], p. 581.) regards the different variants as different combinations of three, originally independent, stories:

a) In consequence of a court intrigue, Rāma, with his brother Lakṣmaṇa and sister (!) Sītā, has to leave the court.

b) The story of the pious Rāvaṇa, acquiring great merits with asceticism.

c) The story of Hanumān, a piece of the ape-worship.

<sup>7</sup> H. v. Glasenapp summarises these opinions as follows: "In der Tat, wenn man die verschiedenen Fassungen des Epos vergleicht und sich dabei vergegenwärtigt, wie vieles bei Vālmīki unerklärlich bleibt, das in anderen Fassungen verständlich wird, die mit ihrer Verwendung primitiver sexueller Motive einer roheren Kulturperiode anzugehören scheinen, dann wird man nicht umhin können, zu glauben, dass Vālmīki, . . . den inneren Gehalt der Legende durch Ausscheidung des Anstössigen, das ihm aus älterer Zeit anhaftete, in sittlicher Hinsicht vertieft und veredelt hat." (*Die Literaturen Indiens*, Stuttgart 1961, p. 109 sq.)



allusions in the authentic parts, amplifying these allusions. Thus, some points of the genealogy and adventures of the rākṣasas are to be found in books II—VI but by far less exhaustively as in the “*Rāvaṇeīs*” in VII, 1—34. *E.g.* the sleep of Kumbhakarna is caused in VI, 61, 23—27 simply by the curse of Brahma, while in VII, 10, 40—48 we find an intricate deceit of the Grandsire. The former motive is the older. — In this connection, stories about the three main heroes of the epic, viz. Rāma, Sītā and Hanumān, are of special interest.

3. The story of the birth and childhood of the great ape Hanumān occurs twice in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, in VII, 35 and IV, 66. The story is essentially the same in both places: the new-born monkey mistakes the Sun for some fruit and leaps to snatch it off but, struck by Indra’s thunderbolt, he falls back on a rock and breaks his jaw (*hanu*, hence his name). The narration is more picturesque in the *Uttara*, where the Sun-devouring demon Rāhu is also involved in the events. *A priori*, it would be possible to think that the *Uttara* conserved an ancient legend, an element of an “ape-poem” older than Vālmīki’s work, a mutilated form of which would be found in the authentic book IV. Textual criticism disproves this possibility for IV, 66 and the neighbouring parts of the text seem to be spurious: *a*) The episode occurs at the end of the book, the place besides the beginning most liable to corruptions. *b*) The text is full of stylistic corruptions: IV, 64, 6 and 7 repetition of *viṣēduḥ*, similarly in IV, 66, 8 and 9 repetition of *vikhyātā-parikhyātā*, IV, 64, 8 is an anticipation of 11 (twofold consolation of Aṅgada), śl. 9—10 being a gnomic interpolation: *na viṣādē manaḥ kāryaṃ viṣādō dōṣavattaraḥ* etc. *c*) IV, 65 contains an increasing enumeration which is typical of the late parts of the Mbh. and R.: competition of the monkey leaders to decide which of them can jump further; in śl. 10 and 14 Jāmbavān begins twice his speech (*Jāmbavān pratyabhāṣata: . . . Jāmbavān idam abravīt:*) with an odd repetition of his own words: *pūrvam asmākaṃ apy āsit kaścid gatiparākramaḥ . . . na khalv ētāvad ēvāsīd gamanē mē parākramaḥ*; in śl. 21—27. occurs a mass of vocative forms, combined with *bhavān*, unusual (especially so many together) in the R. *d*) The whole story of the seduction of Hanumān’s mother by the Wind (IV, 66) is a frequent motive in the late episodes of the two epics, cf., *e.g.*, R. I, 32—33, the daughters of Kuśanābha seduced by the Wind. *e*) The decisive argument against the authenticity of these cantos in book IV, is the Vishnuite character of the text: 65, 15 *mayā vairōcanē yajñē prabhaviṣṇuḥ sanātanaḥ | pradakṣiṇīkṛtaḥ pūrvam kramamāṇas trivikramaḥ*, similarly 66, 32 and 37; 67, 3<sup>9</sup> — On the whole, this episode in IV, 66 is a popular etymology of the name Hanumān. Such etymological and aetiological legends are a speciality

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, Strassburg 1915, p. 14.

of the late book I: I, 2 *śōka* — *ślōka*, I, 23 *Aṅga* — *Anaṅga*, I, 24 *Malada* — *nirmala lucus a non lucendo*, etc. They are alien from books II–VI.

4. The famous myth of the birth of Sītā may be seen as the result of a very similar development. The name means 'furrow', and the birth of Sītā from the furrow is repeatedly recorded in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (I, 66, 13–14; II, 118; V, 16, 16; VII, 98, 7). As the worship of Sītā (or, *the sītā*) can be traced back to the *Rigveda*, it is unanimously accepted that Sītā was originally a chthonic (vegetal) divinity, being later anthropomorphized. Her birth from the furrow is commonly regarded as a remainder of her original rôle as earth goddess. This is, however, uncertain. After the *Rigveda*, a cult of Sītā is unknown till the late epics (Hariv. 3816). The ritualistic literature (the Brāhmaṇas) does not mention her as an earth divinity.<sup>9</sup> In the *Rigveda* itself, the existence of a goddess Sītā is based on a misinterpretation. The word *śītā* occurs in one hymn of the Rv. (4, 57, 6, 7), and here it is an appellative noun rather than a personification. The hymn is directed to *kṣétrasya pāti* 'Lord of the field' who is besought for a rich harvest: 4, 57, 4 *śunām vāhāḥ śunām nāraḥ śunām kṛṣatu lāṅgalam* 'zum Glück seien die Zugtiere, zum Glück die Männer. Zum Glück soll der Pflug die Furche ziehen' (Geldner). The furrow is addressed in this connection: 6–7 *arvācī subhagē bhava śītē vāndāmahē tvā | yāthā naḥ subhāgāsasi yāthā naḥ suphālāsasi || indraḥ śītām nī grhṇātu tām pūṣānu yacchatu | sā naḥ pāyasvati duhām úttarām uttarām sāmām* 'Sei geneigt, du holde Furche; wir loben dich, auf das du uns hold seiest; auf das du uns gute Frucht bringest. Indra soll uns die Ackerfurche festlegen, Pūṣan soll sie einhalten. Sie soll uns milchreich auf jedes weitere Jahr Milch geben.' (Geldner.) This is the same type of addressing as that of the mountains, rivers, forests and trees which is to be found more than a dozen times in the Rv., mostly in the hymns to "all gods" (*ṛíśvė dēvāḥ*), without the existing of a "god" Mountain etc. This type of personification is of improvised character in the Vedic poetry. E.g. 5, 41, 11 *āpa ōṣadhīr utá no 'vantu dyaúr vānā giráyo vṛkṣákēśāḥ* 'the waters, herbs, heaven, woods, mountains with trees as hair may be propitious to us.' Similarly in the neighbouring hymns 5, 41, 8; 5, 42, 16; 5, 46, 6; 5, 59, 4; than in the group 8, 18, 16; 8, 27, 2; 8, 31, 10; 8, 35, 2; and passim 6, 52, 4; 10, 36, 1; 10, 64, 8. N.b. the Earth (*prthivī*) has only one short hymn (5, 84) and one addressing (1, 22, 15, late, also AV. in the funeral ritual!). On the whole, in consequence of the conservatism of religious poetry, topics of agriculture are less frequent in the Rv. than those of nomadic stock breeding.

<sup>9</sup> In TB. 2, 3, 10, 1 Pār. G. 2, 17, 13 (9) Sītā is a quite different goddess.



The occurrences of the myth in the *older part* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* turn out to be spurious passages: V, 16, 15—16 is an eulogy of Sītā by Hanumān in Laṅkā: *iyam sā dharmasīlasya Janakasya mahātmanah | sutā Maithilarājasya Sītā bhartṛdṛḍhavrata || utthitā mēdinīm bhūtvā kṣētrē halamukhakṣatē*. Already Jacobi pointed out that the adventures of Hanumān in Laṅkā are later interpolations in the text.<sup>10</sup> Inner contradictions and stylistic features also prove this from the parts referred to. In V, 15 Hanumān beholds Sītā *repeatedly*: 15, 19—26 *dadarśa . . .* (then in 26—27. and 40. an odd repetition: *tām vilōkya viśālākṣiṃ . . . tarkayām āsa Sītēti kārāṇair upapādibhiḥ*, 40. *tām samīkṣya viśālākṣiṃ . . . tarkayām āsa Sītēti kārāṇair upapādayan*), 17, 3 *sa dadarśa tataḥ Sītām*, 25 (*rākṣasibhiḥ parivṛtām*) *dadarśa Hanumān*. The inferiority of sarga 16 is shown by the character of this canto. After the words *jaḡāma manasū Rāmaṃ* (16, 6, a repetition of 15, 54) Hanumān recapitulates the exploits of Rāma (16, 7—12) and the genealogy and conduct of Sītā (16, 16—20). This genre of *enumerating recapitulation* is unknown in the earlier parts of the poem which use only *repetition*.

The other mention of the legend in the *older part* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* occurs in the last cantos of book II (116—119). Compositionally, this part is independent of the previous events of the book. The plot of the story is finished with canto 115, with the returning of Bharata to Ayōdhyā viz. Nandigrāma. 116—119 are closely connected with the following book III: Rāma, when beginning with his wife Sītā the exile, is requested to help against the *rākṣasas*, and they undertake a pilgrimage in the *āśramas*. In II, 117—119 they visit Atri, in III, 1—13 the ascetics Śarabhaṅga, Sūtikṣṇa, Agastya. The description of the journey belongs to the genre *tīrthayātrā*, alien from the older epics, very popular in the later parts of the Mbh. and in the purāṇas. Rāma's attitude towards the *rākṣasas* is a reflexion of his Vishnuite rôle as helper of the ascetics. This is a characteristic feature of book I (cf. I, 19 where Rāma is requested by Viśvāmitra to conquer the *rākṣasas* Marīca and Subāhu) and of book VII (cf. VII, 61—69, help against Lavaṇa).<sup>11</sup> Similarly, the motif *svaśarīrē divaṃ gataḥ* 'ascending to heaven with his own body' which occurs twice in this episode (III, 5 death of Śarabhaṅga, III, 74 death of Śabarī) is a product of a later period of Hindu religious thought (cf. R. VII, 110 death of Rāma, or Mbh. XVIII, the *Svargārōhaṇa-parva*). To the same period belong the śloka II, 117, 9—12, exaltation of the ascetical merits (*tapas*) of Atri's wife Anasūyā. Similarly, the gift of marvellous ornaments to Sītā in II, 118,

<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.*, 31 sqq., 37.

<sup>11</sup> Just in the seemingly old parts of the Mbh. as, e.g., the Baka-vadha in the Ādi-parva, I, 157—164, the younger elaboration in the *epic* of the ancient *folk tale* motif 'Dragon-killer' (:killing *rākṣasas*) is attested by the prosody: the metre *triṣṭubh* bears here his younger *indravajrā* form.

18—20 is a borrowing from later Mbh. custom; this event is never more referred to in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.<sup>12</sup>

Thus, the only occurrences of the myth that are authentic occur in books I and VII. In the *Uttara-kāṇḍa* this is a short mention of the mother-in-law relationship of the Earth to Rāma: VII, 97, 6 *kāmaṃ śvaśrūr mamaiva tvam tvat-sakāśāt tu Maithilī | karṣatā phālahastēna Janakēnōddhṛtā purā*. Not longer is the record of her birth in the *Bāla-kāṇḍa*; Janaka records: *atha mē kṛṣataḥ kṣatram lāṅgalād utthitā tataḥ | kṣētram śōdhayatā labdhā nāmnā Sītēti viśrutā* (I, 66, 13—14). The brevity of the record is surprising and, if the text is not corrupted (cf. the somewhat irregular grammatical construction of the sentence), it allows the conclusion that even in this period there did not exist an elaborated form of the myth. It is only a popular explanation of the name *Sītā* and belongs to the same type of aetiological legends as Hanumān's birth story. The name is, undoubtedly independent from the Rigvedic personification "goddess Furrow".<sup>13</sup>

5. Beside the stories of Hanumān and *Sītā*, the relations between Rāma and his brothers are shaped in the *Uttara-kāṇḍa* somewhat differently from the Vālmīkian conception. Generally, the brothers affectionately love each other in the *Uttara*, as in the original parts of the poem. Two episodes in book VII, however, show a certain contradiction concerning the idea of the brotherly love. In VII, 105, 9 Lakṣmaṇa, the dearest brother of Rāma, dis-

<sup>12</sup> The text of book III, the *Aranya-kāṇḍa*, Rāma's dwelling in the forest, must have suffered extensive interpolations. Beginning from the last cantos of book II. up to the meeting with Jatāyus (III, 14; or perhaps begins the story only in 17?) the episodes are in no connection with the plot of the story. Independent episodes occur very seldom in books II—VI and are, probably, interpolations, and most of them occur just in this book: apart from the above-mentioned āśrama-stories, III, 9 Indra destroys the merits of an ascetic with a gift of weapons; III, 11 the lake of the five apsaras: *ibid.* Vātāpi, the rākṣasa as ram, referred to also in III, 43; III, 72 story of the monster Kabandha, with the motif "ascending to heaven" repeated as soon as in canto 74, death of Śabarī; III, 2—4 the fabulous adventure with the rākṣasa Virādha snatching the brothers is a variant of the theme *Sūāharāṇa* by Rāvaṇa. In this respect, the book III. *Aranya-kāṇḍa* shows a great similarity with Mbh. III. bearing the same title "Book of the forest" (*Vana-parva*), the largest receptacle of episodes in the Mbh.; cf. Baumgartner, *D. Rāmāyaṇa u.d. Rāma-Literatur der Inder*, Freiburg 1894, 35. Without supposing an immediate influence, it is possible that the reciters followed a general literary pattern in enlarging and colouring the theme of the weird adventures in the depth of the forest.

<sup>13</sup> Further research has to elucidate whether this type of one component names, esp. taken from nature ("furrow", "sand": *Rēṇukā*, "mountain": *Adrikā*, etc.) or indicating simple qualities ("the black": *Kṛṣṇā*) was more common in female names in ancient times or was it a general feature in the lower or non-Aryan classes of Indian society. The monograph of A. Hilka, *Die altindischen Personennamen*, Breslau 1910, is of little use on this question. — The etymology of the name *Sītā* as 'Tamarinde' (Berger: *WZKSO* III [1959], 64) is more than doubtful.



turbs his brother's secret discourse with Time (*Kāla*), therefore he must die. Rāma exiles him and Lakṣmaṇa finishes his life on the bank of the river-Sarayū of his own accord, repressing his breath. Then he ascends to heaven with his own body (VII, 106, 15–17). — In VII, 60–70 the other brother, Śatrughna, on Rāma's behest, conquers the rākṣasa Lavaṇa and reigns in his city. After twelve years, he visits his brother in Ayōdhyā. But Rāma sends him back rather harshly, allowing him to dwell in Ayōdhyā only seven nights: VII, 72, 17 *tvam vasa Kākutstha saptarātram mayā saha | ūrdhvaṃ gantāsi Madhurām sabhṛtyabalavāhanah*. He may pay a visit only seldom and for a short time: VII, 72, 15 *kālē kālē tu mām vira Ayōdhyām avalōkitum | āgaccha tvam naraśrēṣṭha gantāsi ca puram tava*.

Both passages could be interpreted as traces of a rivalry between the brothers, ending in fratricide. Such a tradition, *eo ipso*, could be older than Vālmīki's idealistic elaboration of the story. Compositional features of the given passages, however, argue for the contrary. The exile of Lakṣmaṇa, unknown otherwise in the legend, is a borrowing from Mbh. I, 213, the well-known Arjuna-vanavāsa story: Arjuna goes to exile for entering at an improper moment Yudhiṣṭhira's inner apartment. Such variations of a theme are exceedingly frequent among the *later* episodes secondarily connected with the great epic.<sup>14</sup> The late origin of the legend is also proved by the manner of Lakṣmaṇa's death, the later Hindu custom of religious suicide; furthermore the motif "ascending to heaven", this story in book VII has in common with the secondary episodes in books II and III; see above.

The Lavaṇa-Śatrughna episode contains some compositional contradictions. In VII, 62 the brothers enter into rivalry as to who shall conquer the rākṣasa; in 63, 2–8 Śatrughna, surprisingly, repents his competition: 63, 5 *vyāhṛtaṃ durvacō ghōraṃ: hantāsmi Lavaṇam mṛdhē | tasyaiva mē duruktasya durgatiḥ puruṣarṣabha*, though a heroic enterprise can hardly be a „foolish word” (*duruktam*). An unsatisfying explanation of Śatrughna's desperation is his modesty: 63, 2 *katham tiṣṭhatsu jyēṣṭhēṣu kanīyān abhiśicyatē*. The incompatibility of these motives inspires the supposition that different topics are contaminated in the story, brought in accord in a forced manner with Vālmīki's work. The first topic, beginning the story, is the heroic contest. (*N.b.* Lakṣmaṇa, curiously, does not take part in it.) Then a second topic, relegated into the background, can be supposed: the hero is taken at his unconsiderate word and is sent to a deathly enterprise; that might

<sup>14</sup> See Berger: *WZKSO* III (1959), 51. The variations of a theme in the epics are of two kinds: *a*) the story is repeated, with slight differences, under the same name, e.g. Śibi and the pigeon three times at full length narrated and very often briefly mentioned in the Mbh.; *b*) the type in question, when the same motif underlies to different stories, e.g. the dice of Nala and Yudhiṣṭhira, the rape of Sitā and Draupadī, seduction of different ascetics by apsaras' etc. etc.

be the ground of Śatrughna's desperation. At the same time, this topic is amalgamated with the motif 'punishment for boasting', frequent in the Mbh. (late? cf. Arjuna's death in parva XVII). These heterogenous motives are united and brought in harmony with the Vālmikian pattern with the help of Śatrughna's installation (VII, 63, 10—18). — Moreover, Śatrughna's important rôle is a speciality of the *Uttara-kāṇḍa*; in the other books, he is a quite subordinated personage. It was supposed that he is merely creation of Vālmiki or of some later poet.<sup>15</sup> The name of his enemy, *Lavaṇa*, too, is perhaps only a variant of *Rāvaṇa*.<sup>16</sup>

Some contradiction between book I. and the other books, concerning the relations of the brothers, was pointed out by Jacobi.<sup>17</sup> In I, 73 Yudhājit, the maternal uncle of Bharata and Śatrughna, pays a visit to king Daśaratha and takes the boys with him (I, 77, 15 sqq.). In the authentic text, the mother sends *one* son (Bharata) to her brother; here Śatrughna is not mentioned: II, 8, 28 *bāla* (i.e. before) *ēva tu mātulyam Śatrughnō nāyitas trayā*. Avoiding unwarrantable conclusions, I will only suggest here that in the *Bāla-kāṇḍa*, too, traces of a tradition, different from the Vālmikian ideal brotherhood are reflected.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Leumann: *WZKM* VI, 35, Anm.

<sup>16</sup> Hopkins, *Epic Mythology*, Strassburg 1915, 43. Or is the name simply = the appellative *lavaṇa* 'salt'? — *Lavaṇa*'s genealogy is somewhat confused. VII, 68, 14 makes him a nephew of *Rāvaṇa* (*mama mātṛgvasur bhrātā Rāvaṇō nāma rākṣasaḥ*), but VII, 61, 16 does not know anything about the relationship between *Lavaṇa*'s mother *Kumbhīnasī* and *Rāvaṇa*. In the "*Rāvaṇeīs*" (VII, 1—34) *Lavaṇa* and *Kumbhīnasī* are unknown in the family of *Rāvaṇa*. In the *Uttara*, new branches sprout on the *rākṣasa* family tree, an evolution which is progressively increasing in the Bengālī, Malayan and Javanese *Rāma*-legends. *N.b.* it must be pointed out that the modern Bengālī etc. popular legends do not follow the divergences of the tradition to be found in the *Uttara*. A common feature both in them and the apocryphal *Rāmāyaṇa*-texts is only a cross of literary genres: appearing of folk tale elements in the framework of a heroic (epic) poem. The earliest step in this direction is represented in *Rāmāyaṇa* I and VII and in the Buddhist *Jātaka*; a later (medieval and modern) stage, independent from this, is to be seen in the modern popular legends. The *Lavaṇa-kathā* contains a rich store of clearly folk tale motives: VII, 63, 28 the "dragon" must be defeated in the absence of his "talisman" (*āyudhavinākr̥tam, apraviṣṭam puram*); 64, 8 it must be taken unaware, (*yathā tvāṇ na prajānāti*); 68, 2—4 its way is blocked on returning into its "cave" with the pray; 67, 10 motif "devil deceived": Indra incites *Māṇḍhātṛ* against the invincible *Lavaṇa*. — The passage 64, 7—8 *ēka ēva dhanuṣpānir gaccha tvam Ma-dhunō vanam* follows perhaps II, 89—91 where Bharata visits the ascetic Bharadvāja alone, leaving back his army. The parallelism goes further: VII, 64, 10 *Rāma* fixes the termin of setting out, *grīṣma apayātē* (why? Hopkins' meteorological explanation, *op. cit.*, p. 43, is unsatisfying; in my opinion, this is a reasonless following of literary patterns), as II, 89, 21 gives the termin for Bharata, *maitrē muhūrtē*.

<sup>17</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 53 sqq.

<sup>18</sup> Is this the same "rivalry" motif as the one in the *Uttara-kāṇḍa*? Is Yudhājit anxious about his nephews? — When taking into account the *Daśaratha jātaka*, we



6. Thus, all passages in the original books II — VI of the *Rāmāyaṇa* which seem to be remainders of a primitive pre-Vālmīkian tradition (ape worship, chthonic goddess cult) turn out to be spurious. They are built on the late *Uttara-kāṇḍa* legends and do not justify the supposition that the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* relegated the rude features of the tradition into the background. On the other hand, they represent the first step of a negative evolution which led — under the influence of non-epic folk tale motives and the Arabic style of story-telling — to the medieval and modern popular Rāma legends.

---

can also conclude that different variants of the Rāma-tradition existed already at a very early period. None of them is to be derived directly from the other (as Jacobi contra Weber, *op. cit.*, p. 85; cf. also Winternitz, *op. cit.*, p. 433). — The pseudo-*Rāmāyaṇa* transfers to the heroes of the Vālmīkian epic the theme of another epic cycle (Mbh.): rivalry between the brothers. The jātaka story handles similarly with the folk tale theme "evil stepmother".